



The ATF/APS Career Pathway System (CPS)

**A joint presentation to
the APS Board of Education**

By

Dr. Ellen Bernstein

President

Albuquerque Teachers Federation

&

Dr. Valerie Hoose

Executive Director of Labor Relations & Staffing

Albuquerque Public Schools

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| <u>History</u> | 3 |
| <u>Timeline</u> | 7 |
| <u>CPS Development and Administration</u> | 10 |
| <u>CPS Program Funding and Role of APS</u> | 12 |
| <u>Associated Costs</u> | 13 |
| <u>CPS vs. PDD</u> | 15 |
| <u>Directions for Submission</u> | 17 |
| <u>Examples</u> | 21 |
| <u>Data</u> | 23 |
| <u>Myths and Misconceptions</u> | 25 |
| <u>Next Steps</u> | 27 |

History

Background

In **2002**, the NM State Legislature created a 3-Tiered Licensure System for licensed teachers. But, only for teachers.

Left out were essential colleagues:

- Counselors
- Social Workers
- Nurses
- Interpreters
- OTs
- PTs
- OMTs
- SLPs
- Audiologists
- Diagnosticians
- School Psychologists
- Transition Specialists
- Athletic Trainers

While the 3-Tiered Licensure System guaranteed a significant increase in salaries for teachers, the state also required increased professional responsibilities. In order to advance, teachers were required to demonstrate their competence through the Professional Development Dossier.

Over the next 5 years as minimum salaries of \$30,000, \$40,000 and \$50,000 were phased-in, ATF tirelessly advocated for an analogous career ladder system for Essential and Related Service Educators (**E&RSE**).

By **2005**, we found a legislative sponsor for a bill based on our ATF Position Paper that outlined why No Educator Is Worth Less than any other. The bill would have guaranteed inclusion of all E&RSE in the 3-Tiered Licensure System, with associated salary minimums.

The bill failed that year and the Legislature increased to \$38,000 the minimum salary for Level 2 teachers only. Without action by ATF, this legislative outcome would have resulted in hundreds of E&RSE making less money than their teacher colleagues.

After contentious negotiations with the District, ATF declared an *impasse*. ATF leadership, along with thousands of teacher colleagues, made the bold choice to refuse raises for some, *unless and until* the District agreed to pay everyone equally.

May 10, 2005

Rita Siegel
Director, Labor Relations and Chief Negotiator
Albuquerque Public Schools
P.O. Box 25704
Albuquerque, NM 87125

Andi Trybus
Executive Director, Human Resources
Albuquerque Public Schools
P.O. Box 25704
Albuquerque, NM 87125

RE: NEGOTIATIONS RESPONSE TO APS COUNTEROFFER

Dear Rita and Andi:

We are responding to the district's negotiations counteroffer, presented to us Thursday, May 5, 2005.

Our negotiations have been stalled since the spring of 2004 for one reason: As the exclusive bargaining agent for all licensed, non-administrative personnel working for Albuquerque Public Schools, we are unwilling to separate out and create a substandard compensation system for any of the educators we represent. This would set a precedent that we cannot live with now or into the future.

We all know that as the role of the public schools has expanded, so has the need for all professional employees to work together for the success of the whole child. We work in schools as a team attending to the intellectual, emotional and physical well-being and growth of every child. Although we understand that we now have a state system that places a minimum value on teacher salaries, the licensed personnel working side-by-side with teachers and directly with students must not in turn be devalued.

We appreciate the support of the Board of Education and administration in working toward legislation that would ensure that all licensed personnel are guaranteed the same minimum pay as teachers. However, since HB 83 did not pass, we must turn back to the district and ask you to put a priority on your employees. We will continue to fight for all licensed personnel we represent to be guaranteed the same minimum salaries teachers are guaranteed under HB 212.

During spring 2004 negotiations, when we first raised the issue concerning including these groups in the 3-Tiered Licensure System or creating a new system we were told the district would not agree to such a proposal because the state did not directly provide the funding.

Then the objection seemed to shift. We were told that support and related services educators were not held to the same evaluation standards and paying them the same minimum salaries as teachers would not be fair because in order for teachers to be paid minimum compensation levels and/or advance through the licensure system teachers must meet high evaluation and advancement standards. We suggested that we could jointly develop a rigorous evaluation system and level requirements for these educators modeled after the new state system for teachers by the end of July 2005.

Even though we are willing to create a new evaluation system, the district's position is now that support and related services personnel pay will not be tied to minimum teacher pay.

The answer we received last week does not address what has become a bottom line. As a result, we are at impasse. Any informal ground rules agreed to no longer apply.

ATF launched a public campaign before the APS Board of Education called, **“No Educator Left Behind.”** Month after month, we fought for equal pay for E&RSE, and won! ATF successfully negotiated \$38,000 minimum salaries for Level 2 E&RSE for the **2005-2006** school year. ATF vowed to work until equality is fully restored in a binding agreement with APS.

In **2006**, ATF continued to lobby the Legislature to create a licensure and pay system for E&RSE. ATF organized a letter-writing and email campaign that generated so much activism that legislators complained about the amount of email they received! The bill to create the system went through the legislative process but died in the Senate Finance Committee.

ATF successfully lobbied for an “average” salary increase in the state budget language. The word “average” allowed for the flexibility to negotiate the most money for the most people, including that year's phase-in of a \$40,000 minimum for all E&RSE.

As a condition for guaranteeing the \$40,000 minimum salary for all counselors, social workers, nurses, interpreters, OTs, PTs SLPs, and audiologists, APS insisted that they be held to the same professional requirements for advancement as teachers were in the state's Professional Development Dossier system.

ATF negotiators developed the concept of a Career Pathway System (CPS)—unique in New Mexico—and successfully negotiated an agreement with APS for its implementation. ATF then organized committees of ATF members in all Essential & Related Services job categories to design the Professional Portfolio component of the CPS. We employed the help of a professor at UNM who had expertise in the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards portfolio process to provide technical assistance.

ATF members piloted the Professional Portfolio for the E&RSE Career Pathway System. **Essential & Related Service Educators received the first paycheck of the 2006-2007 contract**

year that included compensation equal to their teacher peers.

In the **2007** Legislative Session, even though a 3-Tiered System for E&RSE failed to pass again, ATF successfully lobbied for an **average** 5% raise and the additional average 2% for all E&RSE. The ability to average raises allowed us to negotiate a minimum salary for Level 3 in the CPS at \$50,000, the same as the teachers.

Since then, all Essential & Related Service Educators in APS today have a way to advance in their careers. **Hundreds of Essential & Related Service Educators have received between \$10,000 and \$20,000 in increased pay as a result of the creation of the Career Pathway System.**

In **2019** the State Legislature increased minimum salaries for **teachers** to \$41,000, \$50,000, and \$60,000 (an average raise of 10.8% to 14.3%) but again only allocated a 6% raise for the other licensed educators serving students. **Once again, ATF negotiated with APS to obtain the same 3-Tier minimums for E&RSEs that were guaranteed to teachers.** ATF secured over \$3 million of additional money to make sure all educators we represent received equal raises. This amounts to an average increase of \$2,700 above the state-mandated raises for each E&RSE employee. ATF also negotiated the ability of COTAs and PTAs to move up to a Level 2 status by securing APS's acceptance of previous service. Many members of these role groups saw raises as large as \$12,000 this year as they moved from Level 1 to Level 2!

Although we are continually disappointed that the state often allocates less funding to raises for E&RSE, ATF is proud of the work we've done for over 14 years to preserve solidarity among all groups we represent.

Timeline



An ATF History of Advocacy for Support & Related Services Personnel

- Counselors • Social Workers • Nurses • Interpreters • Speech and Language Pathologists
 • Occupational Therapists • Physical Therapists • Audiologists
 • Orientation and Mobility Specialists

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>2002</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 3-Tiered Licensure System becomes law for teachers. • ATF creates a position paper advocating for an analogous career ladder system for Support & Related Services Personnel (S&RSP). |
| <p>2004 Negotiations</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ATF goes to impasse during negotiations, holding up raises for teachers and refusing to agree to anything that would divide our bargaining unit and leave our Support & Related Services Personnel behind in pay. |
| <p>2005 Legislative Session</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rep. Mimi Stewart models a 3-Tier bill after the ATF position paper. • ATF continues to lobby the legislature, advocating for Rep. Stewart’s bill to create a system for S&RSP that is analogous to that for teachers. • ATF organizes letter-writing campaigns and school meetings to generate activism in APS and in the legislature. |
| <p>2005 Negotiations</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impasse is resolved. ATF successfully negotiates \$38,000 minimum salaries for Level 2 S&RSP for the 2005-2006 school year, and vows to work until equality is restored. |
| <p>2006 Legislative Session</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ATF continues to lobby the legislature to create a licensure and pay system for S&RSP that is analogous to the teachers’ 3-Tier. The bill was almost passed but died in Senate Finance. • ATF organizes letter-writing and email campaigns. We generated so much activism that legislators complained about the amount of email they received! • ATF lobbies for an AVERAGE salary increase, which gives us flexibility to negotiate the most money for the most people. |
| <p>2006 Negotiations</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ATF uses the averaging language to negotiate 3-Tier pay equal to teachers for all S&RSP. • ATF creates the idea of a locally bargained Career Pathway System and successfully negotiates it with APS. • The Negotiated Agreement is ratified by an overwhelming majority! |
| | |

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Summer 2006 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ATF organizes committees of ATF members in all Support & Related Services job categories to design the Professional Portfolio component of the Career Pathway System. |
| August 2006 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support & Related Services Personnel receive the first paycheck of 2006-2007 that includes the salary increases ATF negotiated! |
| November 2006 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ATF members pilot the Professional Portfolio for the Support & Related Services Personnel Career Pathway System. |
| 2007 Legislative Session | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ATF lobbies the legislature for the 3rd year for a licensure and compensation system analogous to that of teachers. • Even though a 3-Tiered System for S&RSP failed to pass again, we successfully lobbied for an average 5% raise and the additional average 2% for all S&RSP ensuring that Level 3 in the Career Pathway System increased to \$50K. |
| April-May 2007 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thanks to ATF's tenacity at the negotiating table, Support & Related Services Personnel in APS now have a way to advance in their careers. The first portfolio submission window is open! |
| May 2007→ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hundreds of Support & Related Service Personnel receive between \$10,000-20,000 in increased pay as a result of the creation of the Career Pathway System. |
| 2014 Negotiations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ATF lobbyists win the fight in the New Mexico Legislature for both salary increases and a decrease in the class size waiver. • ATF negotiates 3% raises for teachers and support personnel and a \$2,000 increase in the minimums for 3-Tiered System salaries in APS— raising them to \$32,000, \$42,000 and \$52,000. • Despite the Governor's veto of the authorizing language, appropriated funds remain in the state budget. ATF negotiates increases into base pay, including all support and related services personnel—one of the few NM unions to achieve this success. • Speech/Language Pathologists, Physical Therapists, Audiologists, Occupational Therapists and Orientation/Mobility Specialists are moved to the same 184-day work year as their school-based colleagues. The salary schedule for these employees includes one additional paid day. |
| 2015 Negotiations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ATF negotiates salary differentials for A-2 Salary Schedule employees (SLPs, OTs, PTs, and others). |

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ATF and APS agree to form a Task Force to develop a Mentorship Program for Support and Related Services Personnel. • ATF negotiates transfer language for Related Services Personnel. |
| 2017 Negotiations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Won a \$1 million settlement for A-2 salary staff. • COTA's and PTA's are accreted into our union. • Starting the 2017-2018 school year, Diagnosticians, School Psychologists and Transition Specialists will get credit for all years of in-district experience. • ATF creates a Vice President for Support & Related Services. • ATF expands Fed Rep structure to every Support and Related role group. • ATF Counseling, SLP and Social Work committees are formed. |

Over the years, because of ATF's determined advocacy on behalf of Support & Related Service Personnel—lobbying the Legislature, negotiating with the District, and creating the Career Pathway System—hundreds of:

- | |
|---|
| Counselors Social Workers Interpreters SLPs, OTs, PTs and OMTs |
|---|

... have realized hundreds of thousands more dollars in income!

CPS Development and Administration

In agreement with APS, all Essential Service and Support Educators (E&RSE), including COTAs and PTAs, can advance in their careers and pay scales commensurate with teachers. **A task force comprised of practitioners, in consultation with an expert from UNM, made every effort to design the CPS to be as congruent as possible with the Dossier system including Portfolio requirements and costs.**

APS agreed to the CPS system for E&RSEs if ATF would administer the Professional Portfolio part of the system which it has done since 2007.

The E&RSE Career Pathway System is outlined in detail in Article 10 of the APS/ATF Negotiated Agreement. In part, it states the 5 criteria (components) for movement from one level to the next in the Career Pathway System (CPS) are:

1. Years of Experience
2. Differentiated Evaluation Criteria
3. Advanced Credential/Degree
4. Continuing Education Units (CEUs)
5. Professional Portfolio

The Negotiated Agreement also states:

1. An employee must successfully complete the entire portfolio process in order to be eligible for movement to the next Level within the Career Pathway system.
2. If the employee does not pass the entire portfolio, the successfully completed section(s) may be banked for resubmission at the time of the next portfolio submission window.
3. Compensation changes resulting from a change in level shall only occur if the request for movement is submitted prior to September 15.

ATF employs a CPS Coordinator to provide the infrastructure management of the Portfolio process much like the PED's role in the Dossier process for teachers. E&RSE's submit their Portfolio to the CPS Coordinator to be scored by trained readers. The CPS Coordinator follows strict protocols hiring and calibrating readers as well as maintaining confidentiality. Just like the Dossier system, 2 readers independently read and score a Portfolio. If they do not agree, that is, if one scores meets and the other scores does not meet, a third reader scores the work.

Similar to the teachers' dossier system, if some, or all, of the submitted portfolio does not meet standards, employees can revise the sections(s) on their own and resubmit, or they may seek additional support from the ATF. This support is offered apart from the submission

process and includes classes to explain the CPS process as well as individual and resubmission readings with written feedback. The fees for these classes and readings may be found on the ATF website.

CPS Program Funding and Role of APS

APS agreed to the establishment of the CPS if the program did not create administrative costs for the district. Since its inception, the CPS has required additional union funding outside of submission fees to keep the program running.

Currently, it costs between \$10,000 to \$15,000 each year to run the CPS depending on the number of submissions. Approximately 50% of that amount goes to readers. The other 50% goes to administration of the program including, but not limited to, creating yearly budgets, responding to all calls, texts and emails, outreach to role groups, communication with APS about scores, hiring and training ongoing cadre of readers (including calibration each year), reader assignments, candidate notification, website updates, etc.

The cost to E&RSEs to submit a portfolio is \$320. (Teachers pay \$320 for dossier submission.) Resubmissions are \$110. (Teachers also pay \$110 for each of 3 strands that did not pass.)

Separate from these costs, E&RSEs may *choose* to pay for extra help from ATF's CPS professional development system in the form of an overview, individual pre-readings, resubmission readings or small group work.

Starting in the 2019-2020 school year ATF and APS decided to more fully collaborate in the operation of the Career Pathway System. As such, Louise Sanchez, the APS Manager for Certified Staffing, now attends all the reader trainings and, along with ATF, is responsible for answering questions from employees.

Associated Costs

Submission: \$320 for both members and non-members

Resubmission: \$110 for both members and non-members

Reading Requests: \$100 for members; \$200 for non-members

Work Session: \$15 for members; \$50 for non-members

Overview Session: \$10 for members; \$65 for non-members

Resubmission Reading:

For members: \$100 (1-2 sections) or \$125 (3-4 sections)

For non-members: \$175 (1-2 sections) or \$225 (3-4 sections)

All fees are identical to those fees associated with the dossier advancement system and the voluntary ATF support structures.

Money, at a Glance

| School Year | CPS Fees & Overview | Amount Paid to Readers | CPS Coordinator's Salary Paid by ATF |
|---------------|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 2007-2008 | 5,464 | 3,900 | 10,440 |
| 2008-2009 | 6,120 | 5,370 | 10,440 |
| 2009-2010 | 3,900 | 5,150 | 13,650 |
| 2010-2011 | 3,800 | 4,750 | 9,865 |
| 2011-2012 | 5,715 | 2,725 | 9,600 |
| 2012-2013 | 5,385 | 2,500 | 9,600 |
| 2013-2014 | 8,820 | 3,750 | 9,600 |
| 2014-2015 | 6,620 | 4,125 | 9,600 |
| 2015-2016 | 8,895 | 5,625 | 9,600 |
| 2016-2017 | 9,180 | 6,175 | 9,600 |
| 2017-2018 | 10,990 | 6,225 | 9,600 |
| 2018-2019 | 12,900 | 7,075 | 9,600 |
| 2019-2020 | 11,250 | 5,695 | 9,000 |
| 2020-2021 | 6,045 | 2,900 | 9,000 |
| totals | \$105,084 | \$65,965 | \$139,195 |

CPS vs. PDD

| | Career Pathway System | Professional Development Dossier |
|------------------------|---|---|
| State Requires | <p>APS/ATF agreement: movement from Level I to Level II after 3 years. The years of experience can be a combination of in-district and outside experience.</p> <p>We have a joint interest in attracting employees from the private sector, so we have negotiated very generous reciprocity language.</p> <p>Practitioners can advance from level II to Level III in the CPS after an additional 3 successful years of practice and a second successful portfolio.</p> <p>Movement from a teacher license to a support provider holds the candidate harmless at the level they were at in the Dossier System.</p> | <p>Submitting and passing the dossier is mandatory in order to advance in the teacher licensure system.</p> <p>Teacher must advance from Level 1 to 2 no earlier than 3 years as a teacher and no later than 5 yrs.</p> <p>Teachers can remain at level 2 for their entire career.</p> <p>Teachers can advance to Level 3 with second dossier successful submission and 3 successful years at level 2.</p> <p>To advance to level 3 teachers must have a master's degree or National Board Certification.</p> |
| Process at State Level | <p>The APS/ATF system is unique to APS and has no relationship with the PED licensure levels.</p> <p>The Portfolio process follows the same guidelines as the Dossier.</p> <p>Portfolios are submitted on-line and read by 2 readers in their field. Practitioners receive notification of Meets or Not Meets standards by email and provided with general feedback.</p> <p>If a strand(s) does not meet, you can rewrite and submit a resubmission.</p> | <p>Teachers submit a dossier electronically to the PED. Each of the 3 strands are scored by 2 reviewers who are licensed teachers with at least one in your content area.</p> <p>Teachers receive a Meets or Not Meets standards for each strand.</p> <p>If a teacher requests feedback, they get very general feedback.</p> <p>If a strand(s) does not meet, you can rewrite and submit a resubmission.</p> |
| State Charges | <p>The portfolio system charges \$320.00 for submission of 4 sections and an introduction. This is the same fee as</p> | <p>\$320 to submit 3 strands Resubmission: 1 strand \$110</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | the Dossier system and is determined by PED. | 2 strands \$220 3 strands \$320 |
| ATF provides VOLUNTARY support in 5 ways | <p>Overview Sessions: Overview sessions are held 4x per School Year. These are 1.5 hours describing the process, answering questions and providing descriptions for examples.</p> <p>Pre-Reads: Allows candidates to have their portfolio read with suggestions to enhance their submission.</p> <p>Re-Submission Reads: Candidates that had one or more sections that do not meet standards can have their sections read, with suggestions in helping them with re-writes. The candidate can resubmit drafts one more time with feedback.</p> <p>Working Session: A working session is offered in early March for candidates to work on sections preparing for submission.</p> <p>Phone/email support: Candidates can reach out to the coordinator to ask questions, get clarification or talk through the requirements.</p> | <p>2.5 - hour overview of the process. (\$10 members, \$65 nonmembers) Writing workshop with 3 sessions in small groups (\$90 members, \$180 nonmembers).</p> <p>Individual readings with 1 time written feedback on 3 strands (\$100 members, \$200 nonmembers)</p> <p>Resubmission readings with 2 times written feedback on strands that didn't pass (\$100 members, \$200 nonmembers)</p> <p>Dossier "hotline" with short process questions answered by email.</p> |
| ATF support (cost for member and non-members) | <p>Overviews: M-\$10, NM-\$50 Pre-Read: M-\$100: NM-\$200 Re-Sub: M-\$100 (1-2 sections); \$125 (3-4 Sections) NM: \$175 (1-2 Sections); \$225 (3-4 Sections) Work Sessions: M-\$15 NM-\$50</p> | See above |
| Feedback to people who do not meet standards (don't pass) | The notification letter provides Met or Not Met for each section. The pre-reads and re-submission readings give detailed written feedback and offers ways to help the re-submission process. | ATF gives detailed written feedback as described above. There is no detailed feedback given by the state. If a teacher asks, they get general feedback. |

Directions for Submission

The Career Pathway System

The Career Pathway System (CPS) for Essential and Related Services Educators (E&RSE) was developed by the Albuquerque Teachers Federation and the Albuquerque Public Schools as a system that defines professional expectations, expertise and related compensation. Similar to the New Mexico Three-Tiered Licensure System for teachers, E&RSE may advance through three levels. To advance, E&RSE must meet five criteria for movement from one level to the next. The five criteria for advancement in the CPS are:

1. 3 Years of experience in one's current role and level at APS
2. Successful evaluations based on Competencies and Differentiated Indicators
3. Advanced credential/degree as specified per role group
4. Confirmation of Continuing Education Units (CEUs)
5. Score of "Meets Standards" on all sections of a Professional Portfolio

The information that follows will help you to prepare your portfolio.

The Professional Portfolio: General Information

The CPS Portfolio was designed by a group of Essential and Related Services Educators (E&RSE) from the Albuquerque Public Schools and the Albuquerque Teachers Federation. Its purpose is to provide evidence of meeting the competencies and indicators for the following role groups of employees:

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Audiologists | Orientation and Mobility Specialists |
| Counselors | Physical Therapists |
| Interpreters for the Deaf | Social Workers |
| Nurses | Speech and Language Pathologists |
| Occupational Therapists | Athletic Trainers |
| COTA's | PTA's |

How Your Portfolio Will Be Reviewed

1. The Professional Portfolio is designed to be a purposeful self-reflection of specific aspects of your practice including, continual growth, learning and change. The portfolio allows readers to see the reasoning behind your actions through a union of different kinds of evidence. Readers are trained to evaluate all of the evidence you provide to make a careful judgment about the level of competence demonstrated. Each portfolio is reviewed by two trained readers from your role group. If they disagree, the portfolio is reviewed by a third trained reader.
2. The portfolio is meant to demonstrate the gains you have made as you move towards mastery in your field.

3. The portfolio allows readers to see the reasoning behind your actions through a variety of evidence such as data, documentation and narrative.
4. Readers are trained to evaluate all of the evidence you provide to make a careful judgment about the level of competence demonstrated.
5. Each portfolio is reviewed by two trained readers, both of whom are from your role group.
6. If they disagree, the portfolio is reviewed by a third trained reader.
You must receive a score of “Meets Standards” on all four sections in order to fulfill this criterion for advancement.

Special notes

- Those educators at Level 1 in the CPS will create their Professional Portfolio based on Level 2 indicators.
- Those educators at Level 2 in the CPS will create their Professional Portfolio based on Level 3 indicators.
- The Professional Portfolio is only required when advancing to the next level of the CPS.

The Structure of the Portfolio

Your Portfolio is intended to answer the question:

In what ways does my current practice exhibit the professional competencies and indicators of the level in the CPS to which I am aspiring to move?

The portfolio contains:

1. Teamwork with Other Professionals
2. Making a Difference with Students
3. Connecting with the Significant Adults in Students’ Lives (Parents, Caregivers or Guardians)
4. Continuing Education and Change

The Professional Portfolio has an introduction, followed by four sections that correspond to the key areas. The introduction allows you to provide information about the context of your practice, setting the stage for the reviewer. Then, each of the four ensuing sections 1-4 must contain the following.

- A. Narrative – to describe an experience in a key area.
- B. Citation – to reflect on your practice through the competencies: ex: (C3 or Comp. 3) and indicators for your profession and list or cite each competency demonstrated.
- C. Documentation – to illustrate what is described in the narrative.
*(These three elements must be present in each section.)

GENERAL DIRECTIONS

The portfolio will not meet requirements for successful completion if all instruction is not specifically followed.

1. The evidence you provide must be from the current school year or the previous school year.
2. All of the competencies for the role group must be addressed in your portfolio at least once. Different sections of the portfolio can address different competencies. No one section needs to address all of the competencies. Competencies may be addressed multiple times in different sections of the portfolio.
3. All narratives and citations should be typed. Use 12-point font/double spaced, one inch margins. The font style will be in Times New Roman with one inch margins. 3-5 pages of narrative: introduction 5-7 pages of narrative: sections 1-4
 - Citation of competencies will be included throughout the narrative examples: (C1)
 - 3-5 supporting documents (1 document equals 1 single sided page).
4. Each page you submit must have a header that includes: your job category, the portfolio section, the date submitted, page numbers, and your APS ID number. Do not include your name.
5. Maintain your anonymity and protect the anonymity of students and others whose work or image you may use in your portfolio. X out identifying information or replace with pseudonyms. Violations of professional ethics (eg.: breach of confidentiality) will result in the portfolio not meeting standards,
6. Payment for your portfolio must be made no later than the last day of the submission period. Please send or bring in a check or money order for \$320.000 made out to the ATF Teacher Leadership Foundation. (The money collected from portfolio fees is used to pay the portfolio readers and maintain the program.)
7. Keep a copy of your portfolio for your records.
8. The portfolio submission period begins the first business day on/after July 15th and ends at the end of business day on/after March 31st. You may submit your portfolio to be read anytime during this time frame.
9. Each applicant will have one calendar year from the first date of submission to successfully complete their portfolio. If your portfolio does not meet standards after this time, you will be required to begin the process again, using new subjects.
10. An "Intent to Submit" form must be filed at the Albuquerque Teachers Federation office at least 1 month before your portfolio submission. This form can be faxed, emailed, mailed or delivered in person. Failure to do so will result in a delay of your portfolio being read.
 - For the March 31st deadline all Intent to Submit forms (Initial and Re-Submission) must be submitted no later than the last working day of February. Failure to do so will delay the reading of your portfolio until the July portfolio window opens.

- For the September 15th deadline, all Intent to Submit forms must be submitted no later than the 15th of August. Failure to do so will delay passing portfolios to be added to the next contract year's increases.
11. The applicant must successfully complete three years of employment at each level before moving on to the next level. You may submit your portfolio during the third year of your employment for each level, but the successful completion of that portfolio will not result in pay increase until the beginning of the next contract year.

If using acronyms, please define these with first use.

Complete directions and all supports offered by the ATF can be found [here](#).

Examples

Prompt in the directions

Section 1. Teamwork with Other Professionals

Purpose: To demonstrate how you collaborate with colleagues to provide your services for students.

A. Narrative: Describe one or two specific instances of teamwork in which you were involved. It might focus on how you help other professionals understand the services you provide or how you work with others to improve a learning experience/ environment or how you put your heads together to solve problems and address educational issues.

Explain why you entered into this collaboration, your goals, what you did, what you learned through the collaboration. Self evaluate this instance and describe what you might do next or differently. Explain how collaboration with other professionals has enhanced your skills and your program for students. Describe how your contribution as a professional in collaboration with others has improved the situation for students.

Include student examples to show collaboration with others.

You must address the following in your narrative:

- Describe your work with other professionals
- Analyze your reasons for doing this particular intervention
- What evidence is there of student improvement or explain why the intervention wasn't successful
- What did the student learn or accomplish as a result of this intervention
- What did you learn as a result of this intervention
- What were the cultural considerations and how did you address these
- Describe/explain what you would do next or differently
- Examples must show the impact on your students
- Section must include student examples

Below are excerpts from two portfolio responses from Section 1, *Teamwork with Other Professionals*.

Example 1:

As a counselor, I work closely with other professionals to develop and implement a comprehensive school guidance program that aligns with the American School Counselor Association (ASCA). I am going to go into detail on how counseling lessons are developed and how these are based on data collected. I am the representative for the counseling department at Instructional Council (IC) and I also happen to be the scribe. At our school, any special curriculum or special activities need to be ran by and approved by the members of the IC team. The Instructional council is composed of individuals representing different departments within the school. In our instructional council meeting in September of 2019, I brought up the idea to implement a Needs Assessment to the 9th and 11th class. Members of the IC agreed and

acknowledged that data was needed to better understand what the students needed. I shared that the objective was to collect data that influences the counseling department's curriculum and lesson delivery (Competency 1, level 3).

Example 2:

My principal and I worked together to layout the guidelines prior to her approval for going forth. We determined students would spend one day in a class and rotate to another if given a multiple day suspension. Students also could not be assigned to a class of the same grade. Students will spend their suspension time at a desk situated in a designated area away from the others and will transition with that class to lunch, recess, and pull-outs for that day. Students, however, will not be allowed to take part in recess and pullouts, but are to sit and observe. The initial goal was to get these students into a classroom environment where they could focus on schoolwork and their day would revolve around a schedule rather than days wasting away while sitting up at the front. (C-1 Refine objectives from school's needs and priorities.)

In looking at **Example 1**, we read evidence of the applicant working with a team of professionals along with the applicant proposing a Needs Assessment to be implemented with two grade levels. The applicant also provides the objective for collecting data to the team. This applicant did address each prompt in this section.

Example 2 provides evidence of the applicant working with the principal to change the previous in-school suspension practice to another model.

As the submission of Example 2 continues, the narrative provided misses these elements:

- Evidence of student improvement
- Evidence of cultural consideration and how the applicant addressed
- What the applicant would do next or differently
- Examples that show impact on the applicant's students
- Student examples

Data

Pass Rates

| Role group/ Approx. number of employees | S=Submitted M=met RM1-Resub RM2- Resub2x |
|--|---|
| Counselors 248 | S = 184 M = 103 RM1 = 68 RM2 = 8 |
| Social Workers 122 | S = 38 M = 24 RM1 = 19 RM2 = 8 |
| Nurses 123 | S = 36 M = 28 RM1 = 7 RM2 = 3 |
| Interpreters 23 | S = 8 M = 7 RM1 = 1 RM2 = 0 |
| SLP's | S = 24 M = 23 RM1 = 1 RM2 = 0 |

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| OT's | S = 13 M = 12 RM1 = 1 RM2 = 0 |
| PT's | S = 5 M = 4 RM1 = 1 RM2 = 0 |
| Audiologists 6 | S = 3 M = 1 RM1 = 2 RM2 = 0 |
| OMT's 2 | S = 2 M = 2 RM1 = 0 RM2 = 0 |
| Athletic Trainers 9 | S = 3 M = 3 RM1 = 0 RM2 = 0 |

Link to yearly data chart: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1YzEydkqrg9vxfu9-bKWpHFfaOnLz3LSlhFnGo9TYqjIA/edit?usp=sharing>
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1YzEydkqrg9vxfu9-bKWpHFfaOnLz3LSlhFnGo9TYqjIA/edit?usp=sharing>

Myths and Misconceptions

The Career Pathway System as it relates to the Counselors in APS has been bombarded over the past 3 years with rhetoric that has been misleading, wrong, creates distrust, and is often slanderous.

Some of the false statements:

- A. The Career Pathway System is totally run by the Union, with little input from the District.
 - *The original agreement allowed for the program to move forward as long as the Union spearheaded its inception and implementation.*
- B. Union members receive special treatment in the Career Pathway System process.
 - *The process has followed the same guidelines as the Dossier System, whereby portfolios are submitted blind only by ID number. There is never any indication or verification that the candidates are, or are not, members of the Albuquerque Teachers Federation.*
- C. Union members pay less than non-Union members.
 - *The Portfolio submission fee is based on the fees set by the state dossier system. There is only one initial fee which is the same as the state's dossier system: \$320.00.*
 - *ATF has created voluntary support structures that differentiate fees based on union membership status. The differentiation of fees is consistent with our Dossier and National Board support structures. The fees go to pay the support providers. Member's dues make this support possible and as such they are able to access the support for less.*
- D. The union is pocketing the extra money made from portfolio submissions and using it for Union activities.
 - *As you can see from the budget reports provided, there has never been a year (since 2007) that the Portfolio system has not had to rely on financial support from ATF.*
- E. The Career Pathway System withheld information from those interested parties and refused to answer questions regarding how funds were used through the program.
 - *Information has been presented more than once to provide the evidence requested that would address the criticisms. Regardless of the evidence provided from ATF and with APS and ATF together, the misinformation campaign persisted.*
- F. Readers for the Portfolio are from different role groups.

- *Various E&RSE personnel, in addition to Counselors, read portfolios. When the program began there was some Social Workers cross over readers, but that changed over 4 years ago. Currently the readers for the counselor's portfolios are all counselors who have completed Level III portfolio submissions.*

- G. The state provides in-depth feedback for teachers who have not been successful with their dossiers.
 - *The state announced this year that would start providing feedback. To our knowledge the feedback that is now provided is very general. Teachers have reported that the feedback is not helpful as the rewrite a strand.*

- H. Readers fail portfolios so they can earn more money.
 - *Not true.*

Next Steps

- The CPS coordinator meets yearly with readers to review the CPS process and expectations. In the future we might conduct this meeting jointly with APS.
- APS can sponsor or co-sponsor overview sessions.
- APS and ATF can jointly present overview session annually at district meetings with each employee group.
- APS HR staff can be trained as readers and participate in the process.
- Since counselors are the only role group that has concerns, APS can sponsor informational session just for counselors run by APS personnel and not ATF.